

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Claims 18-64 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-17 stand rejected.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks hereinbelow.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. 103:

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al. (US 6,930,718) as applied to claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 15, 16 and further in view of Yap et al. (US 2002/0092021). The applicant respectfully traverses on the following grounds.

1. Claim 1 is allowable over the cited combination in that the cited combination does not teach a controller that is adapted to cause the communication interface to transfer acquired content to the archival storage device and to delete the transferred acquired content from the memory while retaining the presentation content in the memory.

Claim 1, as amended, claims in part that the controller is adapted to receive acquired content from the content source, to form presentation content that corresponds to the acquired content said presentation content adapted for presentation using the presentation system and to cause the acquired content and the corresponding presentation content to be stored in the memory. Further, claim 1 provides that the controller is adapted to cause the communication interface to transfer acquired content to the archival storage device and to delete the transferred acquired content from the memory. As a result of such a process, it is implicit that the presentation content remains in the memory and by amendment to claim 1, this implicit aspect of claim 1 is now made explicit.

A controller that is so adapted provides several beneficial effects. First, the presentation image content occupies a smaller portion of the memory capacity of internal memory 42 than the acquired image content from which it is formed, and second, the presentation content is readily available for presentation without requiring display device 10 to convert acquired image content into presentation content form each time that the acquired content is to be displayed. Further, such presentation content is available for presentation even when the acquired content to which it corresponds is deleted, archived, or unavailable.

In contrast, Parulski, while highly useful and commercially valuable, describes a process wherein an archival image is subsampled on demand to convert the archival image into a “verification image.” Specifically, Col. 43, lines 22-48 of Parulski state as follows with respect to this process:

In a particular example shown in FIGS. 50-51, the digital camera 10 uses a mega pixel imager 24 to capture an initial electronic image, which is then stored as an archival image in the form of a JPEG compressed file on a removable memory card 54a accessed through a memory card interface 412. The camera 10 selectively displays a verification image on the image display 26 that is derived from the archival image by subsampling. (Buttons or other user controls that actuate the verification display and the like are not illustrated in FIG. 50, but can be like those earlier discussed. The digital camera 10 includes a mode that displays editorial suggestions. The editorial suggestions shown in FIG. 51 are enlarge image, enlarge and rotate, and rotate. When the user selects (414) one of the editorial suggestions (in FIG. 50, the suggestion to enlarge and rotate is selected), the archival image is decompressed from the JPEG compressed file and modified by cropping (416) the image data, recompressing, and storing (418) the cropped image file 410 onto the removable memory. The original archival image file 167 is then preferably deleted to save space. If the user actuates display of the verification image, the replacement image file is subsampled to provide a new verification image for display on the image display 26. The replacement image 410 can, optionally, be resampled when cropped, as shown in FIG. 51.

Parulski does not disclose any step of storing the verification image after presentation of the same. Nor is it obvious to do so, as Parulski et al. appears to disclose the ad hoc creation of each verification image by subsampling a selected archival image. This has the effect of relieving the camera memory of the burden of storing both the subsampled verification image and the archival image.

Still further, it would not be obvious to retain such verification images in the display device after the archival image upon which the verification image is based has been transferred to an archival memory system, as such images are typically adapted to conform to particular characteristics of the display upon which the verification image will be presented and are thus of limited value. For example, U.S. Patent No. 6,914,625 (Anderson) describes a system that generates so-called scrennail and thumbnail images which are reduced resolution variants of an image represented by image data in an image file. However, Anderson

shows that such scrennail and thumbnail images are stored within the same file as the archival image:

The exemplary image file 835 includes a header 805, image data 810, a scrennail 815, a thumbnail 820, and image tags 825. Header 805 preferably includes information that identifies and describes the various contents of image file 835. (Anderson Col. 4, lines 55, 60)

It will be appreciated from this that such scrennail and thumbnails images are not retained in the event that the image is transferred out of the system.

2. Claim 1 is allowable over the cited combination in that the cited combination does not teach a communication interface adapted to communicate with an external archival storage device and a controller that is adapted to store such content in an external device.

As discussed above, Parulski describes storing images in a memory in the camera as does Anderson et al. Yap receives images or video files for storage in the device but does not disclose a controller that is further adapted to cause the communication interface to transfer acquired content to the external archival storage device and to delete the transferred acquired content from the memory while retaining the presentation content in the memory.

Accordingly, claim 1 and all claims that depend therefrom are allowable over the cited combination.

II. Claims 2 – 17 are allowable over the cited combination.

Claims 2 – 17 are believed to be in allowable over the cited combination for the reasons stated with respect to claim 1 and further as follows:

Claim 12 claims the digital display device of claim 1, wherein the display device displays the presentation content using an organization structure provided by the archival storage device, so that the digital display device organizes presentation content in a way that reflects the organization of acquired content in the archival storage device. Parulski does not disclose this, nor does Yap. The Office Action contends that the Yap discloses a similar feature at paragraph 150. However, Yap at paragraph 150 states as follows:

[0150] To select buffered programs for recording, the user displays an archive menu in step 1406, which may be effected by scrolling through a main extended pause menu with a suitable user-interface, for example or displayed as a selectable function in EPG

80. This menu displays the buffered programming by channel, program, etc. that has been archived in storage while the user has been watching the display device 370 with extended pause enabled. The display may be in tabular form and may display the day's buffered programming, a specific time period (several hours), and/or a specific past day, depending on the available storage capacity.

Thus what is discussed in paragraph 150 is presenting a buffered list of programs captured by the local device during an extended pause time. The list can be organized by channel. However, such an organizing merely organizes content in a manner that reflects the way in which the content is provided to the device and not the organization of an external archival memory device that stores such content after it has been downloaded or broadcast to the device. More simply stated, Yap shows organization of content within the device based upon the organization of the input to the device, not based upon the organization of acquired content on an external archival imaging system that receives such acquired content as an output from the local device.

For this further reason, claim 12 is believed to be in a condition for allowance. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that in view of the above amendments and remarks, that this application is now in condition for allowance, prompt notice of which is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Roland R. Schindler II', written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 40,802

Roland R. Schindler II/jrk
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-588-2736
Facsimile: 585-477-1148